



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.02.2026

Coram

WEB COPY

The Honourable **Mr.Justice Hemant Chandangoudar**

W.P.No.36985 of 2015

and

M.P.No.1 & 2 of 2015

S.Suganthi

..Petitioner

Vs.

- 1) The Government of Tamilnadu
Rep. by its Secretary, Higher Educational Department
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2 The Chairman
Teachers Recruitment Board DPI Complex
College Road, Chennai-600 006.
- 3 The Member Secretary
Teachers Recruitment Board DPI Complex
College Road, Chennai-600 006.
- 4 Public Information Officer
Teachers Recruitment Board DPI Complex
College Road Chennai-600 006.
- 5 S.Vijaya Priya
Assistant Professor
Department of Home Science
Queen Marys College Chennai.
- 6 Mrs.I.Cini Ezhilarasi
D/o.I.Isreal No.7 Teachers Lane, Cheguttai
Katpadi Vellore-632 007 Vellore District.



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

WEB COPY 7

G.Suba
W/o.Dr.S.Jayakumar 4/82 Vinayakar Koil
Street Pannimadaai and (PO) Coimbatore-17.
...Respondents

Prayer : _

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for records of the 2nd respondent in proceedings vide Letter dated 18.01.2011 in Rc.No.3907/A6 2009 and quash the same as arbitrary illegal and fraudulent as per law and to direct the 1 to 4th respondents herein to appoint the petitioner herein as Lecturer in the department of Home Science in pursuant to the recruitment of lecturers for Government Arts and Science Colleges and Colleges of Education 2008-2009 under Most Backward Class quota.

For Petitioner	: Mr.D.S.Ramesh
For Respondent-1	: Mrs.M.Jayanthi Additional Government Pleader
For Respondents-2, 3 & 4	: Mr.R.Neelakandan Additional Advocate General assisted by Mr.R.Siddharth Junior Standing Counsel
For Respondent-5	: Mr.N.Senthil
For Respondent- 6	: Mr.G.Purushothaman
For Respondent-7	: Mr.K.Thilageswaran



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

Order

WEB COPY

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the Communication Letter dated 18.01.2011 in Rc.No.3907/A6/2009 issued by the respondent, Teachers Recruitment Board (hereinafter referred to as “TRB”), seeking to quash the same and consequently to direct respondents 1 to 4 to appoint the petitioner as Lecturer in the Department of Home Science pursuant to the recruitment for the year 2008–2009 to Government Arts and Science Colleges and Colleges of Education under the Most Backward Class (MBC) quota. By the said communication dated 18.01.2011, the request of the petitioner to consider her for appointment to the post of Lecturer in the Department of Home Science was rejected.

2. The facts leading to the filing of this Writ Petition, in brief, are as follows:

(i) TRB issued a notification in the year 2008 inviting applications for appointment to the post of Lecturer in Home Science under the MBC category for one sanctioned post out of four vacancies.



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

(ii) The petitioner and the private respondents, namely respondents 6 and 7 submitted their applications seeking appointment to the said post under the MBC category.

(iii) Initially, the candidature of the petitioner and respondents 6 and 7 was rejected on the ground that they did not possess the requisite qualifications for appointment. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner and respondents 6 and 7 filed separate writ petitions, namely W.P.Nos.16420 of 2009, 13813 of 2009 and 15796 of 2009 respectively. Pursuant to the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.13813 of 2009 dated 28.07.2010 and W.P.No.15796 of 2009 dated 26.07.2010, the cases of respondents 6 and 7 were reconsidered and they were selected for appointment under the MBC category.

(iv) Insofar as the writ petition filed by the petitioner in W.P.No.16421 of 2009 is concerned, the same was disposed of by order dated 29.04.2010 directing TRB to consider the petitioner's representation dated 23.07.2009 in accordance with law. Pursuant thereto, the impugned communication dated 18.01.2011 was issued rejecting her candidature on the



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

ground that candidates selected under the MBC category had secured 34 out of 39 marks, whereas the petitioner had secured only 28 marks. Hence, the present Writ Petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, as per the Prospectus issued by TRB in 2008, marks were to be awarded as follows: 15 marks for teaching experience; 9 marks for Ph.D.; 9 marks for M.Phil. with NET; 6 marks for PG with NET; 5 marks for publications; and 5 marks for interview.

4. It is contended that respondents 6 and 7 did not possess the requisite qualifications and teaching experience as per the recruitment notification and that the marks awarded to them under the heads of teaching experience and educational qualifications were actuated by mala fides and illegality. It is further contended that the entire selection process is vitiated by arbitrariness and discrimination and that the appointments of respondents 6 and 7 are liable to be set aside.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel for TRB submitted that respondents



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

6 and 7 possessed the requisite qualifications and teaching experience and that the marks were awarded strictly on merit. It is contended that there is no illegality or infirmity in the selection process and that the writ petition is devoid of merit.

6. The learned counsel for respondents 6 and 7 submitted that they possessed the requisite qualifications and teaching experience as stipulated in the recruitment notification and that their selection was based purely on merit. It was further submitted that the selection and appointment took place in the year 2012, whereas the present Writ Petition was filed only in 2015, after an inordinate delay of about three years, without any sufficient cause. Hence, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

7. I have duly considered the submissions made on either side and perused the materials placed on record, including the original records produced by TRB.



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

8. The principal contentions of the petitioner are: (i) respondents 6 and 7 did not possess the requisite qualifications; (ii) the marks awarded to them were actuated by mala fides and discrimination; and (iii) the teaching experience certificates produced by them are fake or invalid, particularly in the case of the seventh respondent whose experience relates to a Nursing College.

9. It is seen from the records that respondents 6 and 7 possessed the requisite qualifications as per the recruitment notification. This Court had earlier directed TRB to produce the original records relating to the selection and award of marks. The same have been produced and perused.

10. On perusal of the records, it is evident that respondents 6 and 7 were awarded 15 out of 15 marks for teaching experience; 5 marks for interview; 8 out of 9 marks for educational qualifications; and 5 marks for publications. In comparison, the petitioner secured only 28 out of the total 39 marks prescribed for the MBC category, whereas respondents 6 and 7 secured higher marks based on their qualifications and performance.



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

Therefore, the contention that the selection process was actuated by malafides or discrimination cannot be accepted. The award of marks appears to be in accordance with the criteria prescribed in the notification.

11. With regard to the teaching experience certificates, the certificate of the sixth respondent shows that she served as Lecturer in D.K.M. College for Women, Vellore, and the same was duly countersigned by the Joint Director of Collegiate Education. Similarly, the seventh respondent's certificate shows her appointment as Lecturer in RVS College of Nursing, Sulur, for relevant subjects, and the same was countersigned by the competent authority.

12. The recruitment notification requires teaching experience certificates issued by Universities or accredited Colleges and duly countersigned by the competent authority. The certificates produced by respondents 6 and 7 satisfy these requirements. Hence, the contention that the certificates are fake or invalid is untenable. This Court finds no illegality, arbitrariness or discrimination in the selection process conducted by TRB.



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

13. Further, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for respondents 6 and 7, the petitioner has approached this Court after considerable delay. The recruitment notification was issued in 2008, selection was completed in 2012, and the present writ petition was filed only in 2015. No satisfactory explanation has been offered for such delay. On this ground also, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

14. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has not made out any case warranting interference.

15. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed as being devoid of merit. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

12.02.2026

Index : yes/no
Neutral Citation : yes/no

9/11



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

To
WEB COPY

- 1) The Government of Tamilnadu
Rep. by its Secretary,
Higher Educational Department
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2 The Chairman
Teachers Recruitment Board DPI Complex
College Road, Chennai-600 006.
- 3 The Member Secretary
Teachers Recruitment Board DPI Complex
College Road, Chennai-600 006.
- 4 Public Information Officer
Teachers Recruitment Board DPI Complex
College Road Chennai-600 006.

Hemant Chandangoudar ,J.,

sd



WEB COPY



W.P.No.36985 of 2015

W.P.No.36985 of 2015

12.02.2026